

In the United States Court of Federal Claims  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS  
No. 22-1619V

SERINA JOHNSON,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: February 29, 2024

*Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for Petitioner.*

*Joseph Douglas Leavitt, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

**RULING ON ENTITLEMENT<sup>1</sup>**

On October 31, 2022, Serina Johnson filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, et seq.<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) resulting from adverse effects of an influenza (“flu”) vaccination she received on November 12, 2019. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the vaccination was administered within the United States, her symptoms persisted for more than six months, and neither she, nor any other party, has ever received compensation or her vaccine-related injury. Petition at 1, 4. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

<sup>1</sup> Because this Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc>, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On November 29, 2023, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Respondent concluded that Petitioner's claim meets the Table criteria for SIRVA. *Id.* at 8. Specifically, Respondent determined that "[P]etitioner had no history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of the affected shoulder prior to intramuscular vaccine administration that would explain the alleged signs, symptoms, examination findings, and/or diagnostic studies occurring after vaccine injection; she more likely than not suffered the onset of pain within forty-eight hours of vaccine administration; her pain and reduced range of motion were limited to the shoulder in which the intramuscular vaccine was administered; and there is no other condition or abnormality present that would explain petitioner's symptoms." *Id.* Respondent further agrees that "this case was timely filed, that the vaccine was received in the United States, and that petitioner satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of her alleged injury for more than six months after vaccine administration." *Id.*

**In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**

Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master